Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/viewpoint6151unse

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 6, No. 1 October 18, 1968

THE CONTRIBUTORS

THE NOISE OF WORSHIP--REFLECTIONS ON CHAPEL ..... J. Randall Nichols
OCTOBER 3

A MISCONCEPTION ..... Clark Wiser

WARD 5B ..... Carol Moseley

TO ----- ..... Theodore Atkinson

IN TEMPO EINES GEMÄCHLICHEN LÄNDLERS ..... Dan Pure
("The dance is over")

METROPOLITAN GREETINGS ..... George Mooken

THE EDITORS

John Patton Curtis Kearns Ted Atkinson Clark Wiser

Celia Smithers William Larkin Galen Yoder

VIEWPOINT originated as a response to specific needs on the seminary campus. It is a semi-monthly publication evolving from a genuine concern for a medium to express campus opinion on pertinent issues, to expose creative writings otherwise unnoticed, and to stimulate intellectual and spiritual give and take within the theological community. We seek to maintain that spirit. Material should be submitted, preferably typewritten and double spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which it is to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

THE NOISE OF WORSHIP--REFLECTIONS ON CHAPEL, OCTOBER 3

J. Randall Nichols

The Editors have asked me to write something about the chapel service which Mr. Bartow and I conducted on October 3--a service which differed from the ordinary by "shadowing" each liturgical element (of the No. 2 Order of Worship) with an item selected from one of several recent daily newspapers.

My only purpose in writing these reflections is to raise some questions about innovation in worship which may be of wider interest than commentary about a single chapel service. I have no great emotional investment in that particular occasion! It might be well in passing to say that while I welcome what looks like a more favorable than ever environment for liturgical innovation this year in Miller Chapel, I am entirely opposed to any "creative" undertaking which is not supported by at least the germ of a systematic rationale. And it strikes me that VIEWPOINT essays written by the respective chapel leaders after these services--something along the lines of what I am trying here--might be a good practice to cultivate.

So far as the October 3 chapel is concerned, I want to reflect on it from two angles: first, what we attempted to do (and why); and second, some issues this particular occasion may have raised concerning the role in general of chapel worship in a seminary setting.

I.

I should like to think that two things were (by design) immediately noticeable about the chapel. First, the newspaper material was intrusive. It ran parallel to the expected order of worship, "Antiphonally," you could say, but the two streams never intersected: it was not "dialogue." What is more, there was no intended topical consistency among the newspaper items. Some of it was trivia, some pertained to important events but was not itself news material of central importance, and there was no systematic "theme" in either the news material or its juxtaposition to the liturgical material. (I discover, however, that many of the people I have talked to about the service spent some considerable energy trying to find the "meaning" of the material, trying to puzzle out what a news item had to do with its adjacent liturgical item!)

The second thing I hope was noticed is that the order of worship was entirely intact. Everything called for by the No. 2 Order was done in its place (except for the anthem, which I think you would be hard-pressed to justify as liturgically essential!) (Another interesting reaction I gathered: one man commented that it was too "subjective," that the liturgy per se should be allowed to exercise its "objective" influence on the flow of congregational awareness and response. Without taking on what I

believe is a falacious subject-object dichotomy, I can only point to the fact that the "objective" order of worship was all there both in form and content, doing what it was supposed to be doing--except apparently it did not succeed, which might raise some question about the efficiency of an order of worship per se in performing this particular kerygmatic function.)

If a person noticed these two things and asked, "All right, then, just what was the point?" I would reply along these lines: the point was precisely that the liturgical material was competing with the newspaper for audience attention, understanding, and integration into awareness. Borrowing the jargon of communications technology, it was a deliberately "noisy" service.

Whether the daily newspaper (or its functional equivalent in everyday situations) is a vaguely operant concern "in the minds" of a congregation, or whether it is a structured transmission of signals from the lectern is in one important sense immaterial. All we did was bring into the lectern what may very well go on in a receiver's attention anyway--and that is in the nature of a hypothesis undergirding this chapel experiment.

Make of that what you will. The aspect I am interested in is the question such "noise" raises for the adequacy of a minister's assessment of and response to one of the obstacles to his communication. It seems to me utterly naive to assume that because a worship context is relatively quiet in an acoustical sense it is, ipso facto, "noiseless" in a communicational sense. I wanted that fact demonstrated as vividly as possible.

If a worshipper's reaction was along the lines of "It was all a blur," or "I tried to make sense of it but finally gave up," or "What was that all about?" then I believe he got the "point" (even if he didn't know he got it). You could extrapolate these same kinds of reaction to an ordinary service of worship and to an ordinary worshipper and I believe you would find the fit alarmingly close.

II.

The second question I want to deal with (and which must, unfortunately,be given short shrift here) was raised by at least two articulate critics of the chapel, viz., "Was that an appropriate use of a worship setting?" Or was it more appropriate to the liturgical laboratory, speech classroom, or continuing education "case study" seminar? Was this chapel an exercise in instruction via negativity and therefore a violation of the implicit contract for worship which the worshippers may be presumed to bring into Miller Chapel?

The issue here may require us to ask anew what purpose chapel serves in this Princeton Seminary scene. I have just a hunch that many seminary students (and faculty) treat the chapel service as an opportunity to

worship in an "ordinary" way which is denied them when they themselves are conducting worship. And while the sought-after "ordinariness" may readily admit innovation, it cannot contractually be allowed to move into the realm of symbolic reflection on the minister's role in itself as leader of worship.

Behind all this is the question whether a minister can ever have the same kind of "worship experience" as his congregation (dodging here the question of what "worship" is). I propose here only that this is a question ministerial students must eventually face, and the sooner the better.

My own view is that the leader of worship does not and cannot while remaining a responsibly professional communicator "worship" in the sense his congregation does. His task is to maintain a critical and interpretative level of reflection on what goes on during a worship service--including his personal influence on the "objective" substance of his communication--in order to guide that experience. Or, to borrow a somewhat infelicitous term, he must not only "communicate" but also "metacommunicate"--a responsibility unique to his role as worship leader and which is abrogated the moment he becomes his own receiver by "worshipping along with the congregation."

I even tend to think that an existential realization of "vocation" to a ministry of proclamation--in whatever form--consists in the minister's being able to admit that worship <u>for him</u> occurs not as an alternative and still less as a threat to, but precisely <u>within</u> his reflective role as leader of worship.

My opinion here is, of course, entirely gratuitous. The point is simply that if the October 3 chapel denied the attending ministers their ordinary worship experience, then perhaps it should be asked whether that is not something they had better get used to and integrate into their sense of vocation, because there is at least one side of an argument which says that vocation is thereby existentially defined! (I would argue this same way, incidentally, in favor of the "artificiality" of the homilectics classroom--it is "artificial" in one main sense only if you expect of a preaching class something which I am proposing a preacher relinquishes in his vocation.)

I leave more things up in the air than I would like, but that is the nature of the VIEWPOINT game. There is but one last item I would like to mention. Granting our intention that there be no topical significance to the news material, etc., there <u>was</u> nevertheless a deliberate intention to allow the <u>form</u> of the service to serve as an exegesis of the text from Isaiah 6. I wonder if anyone caught that! And if they did not, I wonder if perhaps that is not the best exegesis, in a world that is embarassingly rich with hearing and seeing, but poverty stricken in understanding and healing. And if a chapel service no more than demonstrates how easily the word of God is lost--being by design of the same form as the words of men--then perhaps it is not an altogether wasted time of worship for them in whose care the word has fallen.

A MISCONCEPTION

Clark Wiser

Hell is not as you would have it,
 eternal suffering in flame and
 molten pain -
but more -
the silent fluttering of
ragged, iridescent wings
against the mighty gates
that must remain forever locked.

FOREWORD: the following is a "hospital poem", one of many diverse products of a summer of clinical training. For those initiated to the jargon, it is one half of a verbatim--without the "pastor's" responses (You are invited to supply your own!).

WARD 5B

Carol Moseley

I wish they'd give me something for the pain.
The nurse can't help--don't ask--she's waiting on
the doctor's word. I'm waiting too, a whole
week now, for surgery. My spirit's sore,
can't hardly bear the traction on my leg.
Late afternoons the pain comes strong and cuts
us off, apart from even talking bed to bed.
A sleepless night's a lonely time,
though shared with seven others in the room.
It's fearsome how the mind goes roaming then;
can't keep it off my troubles though I try
to pray. Some crazy man upstairs on eight
screams all night long. The cold thermometer
at five is welcome to my tongue tired out
from talking to myself. Once bathed and clean,
I sometimes sneak a bit of sleep, at least
can watch the world outside. My sister's late--
I want to hear her word about my boys.

I wish I could get up and help out here:
I've always had an active life--no choice
about that matter--but hard work, it keeps
your mind off of yourself so much. Mind you,
I don't bear grudges 'gainst the life that put
me here. I've tried to make a clean safe home,
Lord knows I have, and bring my kids up right.
And now there's naught to do but wait. He knows

I've tried and what I've had to bear, and He
will judge and so I'll wait for His "Well done,"
since others don't seem to see it that way
just yet. The wrong don't last, can't last, forever.

A woman's work don't get her anywhere.
I guess a woman's always waiting for
some man or on his word. I still recall
long hours in the wagon while my Daddy talked
inside the store. Later, a girl, I waited for
the curse which made of me a woman too;
sat Sundays on the porch and waited for
the right someone to come and swing with me.
And seven times I waited for a child,
three times in vain, and seven years to wait
for this gold ring, though it was legal from
the first. And waited on hens laying eggs
for bits of cash to buy some Christmas toys
for boys who couldn't wait to tear them up;
waited on hundreds of messes of green beans and sweet corn,
to pick and string and cook and dish up, so
that I could wait to eat mine kitchen-cold.
A woman's work don't get her anywhere.

All men are born impatient things--they want
it when it suits their fancy--which means they
want some woman to wait and keep it warm
for them. You're wise to learn to wait, because
you only wear down sooner fighting it.
To wait's the loneliest work--that's why
it's women who learn best to wait upon the Lord--
the Lord works slow and men can't stand to wait.

I wish they'd give me something for the pain.

TO -----

Theodore Atkinson

I clothed my soul in metaphors
And my words in ambiguity
And climbed upon a winged horse
Upon a sandy sea.
I tried to close the breach
Between the love of yesterday
And the love I hoped would be
But there was only me to choose the way
Amid all the possibility

And only the wild swirling sand
To blur my mind
And take my hand.

IN TEMPO EINES GEMÄCHLICHEN LÄNDLERS
("The dance is over.")

Dan Pure

There are nights when even Lovers dare not sleep:

With all the ceremony of ancient worlds, we
approached the river's edge.
Faints sounds
combined to create
a simple fantasia
a pavane only for the very young.
As we parked in the drizzling rain,
blue and white flames
lilted
upon the waters surrounding us.
No longer were we lone, obscure beings
who search for glimpses
of their lovers in shifting dreams.

We were truly together. And away from the world
at last, we gave in to each other's arms.
All at once the singularity of our love
dissolved into the polyrhythmicality
of determined hearts,
the unforeseen percussion of the rain
and those punctuating horn calls.
Once more, our love unfolded
to uncertain joys

and to unexpected miseries...

...until an inpenetrable chord

Struck
suspending the string of our deceptions
in the off-centered night.
The air-
touched only with despairing whispers-
poisoned the garlands
we had embroidered around our embrace.

I could barely feel
that tender purple light now glowing

ever more dimly between her breasts.
In vain I lingered,
awaiting the incantation of her voice.
Then suddenly, she too
realized the irrevocable loss;
and still holding me,
she turned her face away
and wept.

METROPOLITAN GREETINGS

Dear friends at Princeton:

A strange name, but no stranger! This is George Mooken saying "hello" to you. Since I had to leave 307 Hodge Hall in response to a telegram from my Church in the middle of September, I could not meet many of you to say goodbye. I was consecrated as a bishop at Baghdad, Iraq, on the 21st of September, on the birthday of Virgin Mary (not mother of God! As a true Nestorian, on my consecration day I spoke of Mother of God and mother of Christ and a little bit of the Nestorian controversy. What else could I speak on the birthday of St. Mary?). On 29th I was promoted to the rank of a Metropolitan (Archbishop). Soon I will be leaving to take charge of my archdiocese in India (Don't ask me how large is my archdiocese! To speak the truth, geographically, it is very big. It includes not only India, but even the neighbouring countries, which means the unfriendly neighbours such as China, Pakistan, Burma and perhaps even Vietnam! If it includes Vietnam, perhaps, I may have to appear with Bob Hope for Xmas entertainment in Vietnam, because I remember seeing on TV (one of my minor vices!) Cardinal Spellman and Billy Graham with Bob Hope along with Miss India, who was Miss World that year.

I will miss you. And you will miss my beard and the spoons. (Can anybody put more than 11 spoons now?). Hodge Hall phone may ring for a long time without anybody to answer. Everything seems to be thing of the past. Now everyday people come here to kiss my hand and receive blessings. I am supposed to sit serious.

You may like to congratulate me. You may think it is a great honor. But it is a great responsibility. When I received the telegram, the new Korean student, Mr. Kim, looked at my face which expressed concern, asked me whether it is a good thing or a bad thing to become a bishop in my Church! Looking at the internal troubles of my Church, I feel like asking what will be your reaction if you are appointed as the Prime Minister of Biafra?

Excuse my long letter. It is my duty to write to you and let you know about this important event in my life. I request your prayers. I especially greet the summer language students whom I had the privilege of knowing, living together at the Hodge Hall. After I get settled down in India, I hope that I will have more time to write.

With prayers & best wishes,

George Mooken

* * * *

J. RANDALL NICHOLS is a graduate of Princeton Seminary, presently a doctoral candidate, from Edmond, Oklahoma.

CLARK WISER is a junior BD candidate from Los Angeles, California.

CAROL MOSELEY is a senior BD candidate from Saratoga, California.

THEODORE ATKINSON is a senior BD candidate from Newark, Delaware.

DAN PURE is a middler BD candidate from Barrington, New Jersey.

GEORGE MOOKEN was a former Th.D. candidate from Kerala, India, who was recently appointed Metropolitan Mar Aprem, Archbishop in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 6, No. 2 November 1, 1968

THE CONTRIBUTORS

HUMPHREY, THE LEAST OF THREE MAJOR EVILS ..... Vern McCarty

A LONG WAY TO DAWN ..... Celia Smithers

THE NEXT VIETNAM ??? ..... Graham Shaw

POEMS ..... Peter Amerman

UNDERTOW ..... William Wilson

THE FAILURE OF LIBERALISM ..... Galen Yoder

THE EDITORS

John Patton Curtis Kearns Ted Atkinson Clark Wiser

Celia Smithers William Larkin Galen Yoder Jim Cubie

VIEWPOINT originated as a response to specific needs on the seminary campus. It is a semi-monthly publication evolving from a genuine concern for a medium to express campus opinion on pertinent issues, to expose creative writings otherwise unnoticed, and to stimulate intellectual and spiritual give and take within the theological community. We seek to maintain that spirit. Material should be submitted, preferably typewritten and double spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which it is to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

HUMPHREY, THE LEAST OF THREE MAJOR EVILS

Vern McCarty

Not too long ago I spent a couple of days in middle-class suburbia in the D.C. area. Nixon, Agnew, and Wallace were doing very well there. I could find only one man on the street where I was staying who planned to vote for Humphrey.

People who live in suburbia are concerned primarily with their own personal safety. They are also concerned with "getting ahead in life" in regard to material and financial things. Their third major concern is that their immediate surroundings remain clean, decent, and respectable. Consequently, they do not want blacks to move in near them, or at least not very many blacks, because blacks tend to promote filth and indecency, especially when they congregate in large numbers. Last but no least they are continually preoccupied with Communists and Communism. Communism, they say, is evil and must be eliminated in all of its manifestations, among student radicals, in universities, in the Church, in foreign countries, and in Heaven as well if any should be found there. Oh yes, about the war in Vietnam, they know that there is a war because they see it on T.V. for a few minutes each evening. But they are also sure that the Communists started it. Even so, many of them are "against" the war because it eats up so much tax money.

I submit that the campaign of Richard Nixon was designed and is being carried out exclusively to appeal to the prejudices, fears, and hatreds, of the white masses described above. What is even more astounding is that the great American people have swallowed Tricky Dick and his half-illiterate running mate, hook, line, and sinker. What do we as seminarians do in this situation? For whom do we vote? We could cutely declare that all three candidates (Humphrey, Nixon, and Wallace) are racists and cast our vote for Dick Gregory. Or we could say that we are waiting for the "Revolution" and do not intend to vote at all. Or we could join the 13 and 14 year olds and support Pat Paulson.

Or we could, as responsible and well-informed citizens, claiming to have some sense of ethical responsibility, cast our votes for the least of three major evils.

No, I have not been paid off by the Daley-Johnson machine. I worked hard for McCarthy and for Robert Kennedy until he was shot. It's just that I don't want to see the country taken over by a fascist, amoral, demagogue, such as Nixon. At least Humphrey has a good record in the Senate in sponsoring worthwhile legislation. Nixon's record consists of a lot of loud, empty, and even specious babbling about things in general. Humphrey has come out with a clearer and more reasonable position on the war, and would probably say more if it were not for his position as VP. Humphrey is for adopting the nuclear non-proliferation treaty whereas the brilliant Mr. Nixon says he thinks we should "wait a while" before ratifying it. When asked by a delegate at the Convention in Florida

how he felt about Federal open housing legislation, Mr. Nixon said--

> "I felt then and I feel now that conditions are different in different parts of the country. Just like with gun control, it ought to be handled at the state level rather than the Federal level." (New York Post, 1968)

A LONG WAY TO DAWN

Celia Smithers

God bless you, pilgrim,
you're hungry.
You're on the road
and seek food to refresh you,
drink to ease your thirst,
rest to renew your body.

You're hungry
and see no Inn along your road,
no wayside rest
where you might find bread and drink.
And perhaps a bed.

You have come a long way,
I can tell,
and are weary.
You want to cry out for
Food
to fill your aching void.
The journey has been long for you,
and you feel new pain with each step.

You have come through
storms
and dark nights of fear and death;
have come out of darkness
into light,
light made glorious by the rose of a new dawn;
have recovered from the storm
and delighted in
the wonder of healing sunshine
and love,
and perhaps a comrade along the way;
have been grateful
for the way you trod
and for the victory given you.

Until,
without warning, pilgrim,
a violent burst
of seeming anger struck at
your healing heart
and you fell
in the rage of wind and rain
and cold -- and darkness. . .
fell into the mud
which you thought was gone;
fell before the wind
which you thought had ceased to rage.

And now, pilgrim,
God bless you --
the storm has worn you out.
You are hungry
and seek even a morsel of food.

I understand your search,
your hunger,
your agony,
and I have watched with pain
as you struggled,
fell,
collapsed --
but got up again
to continue on your way.

As I watched,
your struggle tore my heart;
and my eyes winced
as you fell into the mire;
my ears hurt at the
roar of the storm -- !
and then I woke up
and saw the
dawn!
And you were still there,
pilgrim.
You were still on your way, and
I have <u>slept</u> while you
fought the night
and pulled yourself up
out of the mire.
and then I woke up
and saw the
dawn!
God bless you, pilgrim.
You were <u>in</u> the dawn

and your soiled clothes
and heaviness of foot
scolded my sleeping
and said more than
the storm
or words or winds
or rain.

And I opened my door,
so long bolted and guarded.
The hinges creaked.
And then I woke up
and saw the
dawn --
and you.

I didn't ask
who you are, or
where you were going,
for suddenly --
I knew, as
the sunlight slipped in
with you.

THE NEXT VIETNAM ???

During this Election Campaign a small group of Dutch people have come to the United States to remind American voters of the international significance of their decisions. Whether other nations like it or not, part of their future may well be decided by American voters on November 5th. This underlines the responsibility of the American people, and if that responsibility is to be used creatively and in a Christian manner, it is essential that Christians are adequately informed on international issues. Yet because of America's geographical isolation, and her enormous size and diversity, there is a tendency for American news-media to exaggerate the remoteness of other people and their problems.

Here in this community, where one in ten of the student body is from abroad, the encounter between Americans and other people cannot be avoided:

Is this an embarrassment or an opportunity?
Do you find it easy to get to know international students and to talk to them?
Do you find you have anything or nothing in common?
How remote are we?

If the presence of international students here is to be fruitful for all concenred, it must rest on a basis of understanding. During our time here we read your newspapers, watch your television, hear and

iscuss your problems. In return we want to tell you about our affairs nd hear your views about them. Towards this end the international stu-ents will be organizing a series of Forums on controversial issues in sia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe. We have chosen to focus on areas f mutual concern, so that all the problems we will be discussing directly oncern the United States. Tomorrow they may be as much an issue for all hristians as Vietnam is today. The topic of our first International orum will be the Arab-Israeli conflict, which will take place on Thurs-ay, December 5th.

Although these Forums will be organized by the international students, e are hoping for a predominantly American audience. Please come and find ut about us before our affairs make crisis headlines in your press.

Graham Shaw, Chairman
Steering Committee of International Students

POEMS

Peter Amerman

1.

Sometimes when your eyes open into me
They let lemon droplets in my mind,
Sour that we are not I,
But pleased with the exotic pain of
Two trains running intimately parallel
Snycopated rhythm in the night
Yet never touching.

2.

If I could show you
The blueprints of my soul's cellar
Chasing you withdrawn into private shadows,
Still I think I would, just to let you see
Those cobwebbed antiques, the masked colors
Which are me.

UNDERTOW

William Wilson

Eternities ago, our eyes caught
in a sky-blue gaze for one
electric second. And there was
(in that second) an infinite
mad, time-stopping attraction.

Why, I wonder, were we so stupid
as to let it drift out with the
tide that afternoon. Perhaps we
should have abandoned time for
that sun-glistening beach.

I wonder, too, if the beach
remembers us as star-crossed
lovers who were never willing
to soften, to gaze, to accept.
But saw their love running out -

like the moon with the sea.

THE FAILURE OF LIBERALISM

Galen Yoder

American Liberalism as a political philosophy has reached a period of crisis. Advocates of this creed include those who recognize social injustice in the form of racism and poverty, and believe that by some modification of the existing social system, these two evils may be eliminated in time. The strategic priority is to make the change through the current system by passing legislation. Some of the apparent work that the Liberals have accomplished in the last two decades is commendable, yet their understanding of how to change individual attitudes and incorporate the voice of alien elements into systematic changes has been less than desirable.

The Liberals have been striving to attain the "good life"--as defined by Liberals--for all. Their good intent and sincerity cannot be denied at many points. Perhaps it has been the world view of Liberalism that has led it to have the failures it has had. The Liberals have viewed the world through the eyes of the white, middle class. To the white Liberals, black has not really been as beautiful as white, yet they have felt that discrimination against "colored" folks needed to be eliminated. Tokenism has prevailed. The Negro who has made it by middle-class standards has been awarded offices. He, too, has taken on the style of Liberalism. To the black militant, the black Liberal has become the Uncle Tom of the 1960's.

Self-determination as a concept in meeting human needs has been ignored in many areas. Both the black and white Liberal have emphasized the problems of minority groups who have made it by middle-class standards. For example, legislation has been passed against housing discrimination, but little has been done to improve the living conditions of the poor. What has urban renewal done? It has cleared out slums, broken up meaningful social ties, and built dehumanizing high rise apartments that the poor couldn't afford to live in. In most cases their only alternative has been to move in with overcrowded relatives. Liberalism in the church has meant having a white sociologist in to tell what was wrong with Negro families. At Columbia University it has meant one million dollars from the federal government to study the mental illness of the people who live in Harlem. The Liberal-cause orientation has assumed underneath it all that getting the good life for the Negro meant integrating him into a sick, white society--a society whose mainstream values precipitate neurosis.

The Liberal cause has been weakened by its emphasis on making it in the white, middle-class world. Gradualism has undercut the Liberal-cause orientation because it has taken time to "reason" with the Establishment. It takes time to make change through the channels provided by the system. Liberals have been under the illusion that somewhere in the future things would be all right if they were gentleman-like and not too offensive with the Establishment. Because of this mind-set, Liberals became the chief persecutor of those who have gone too far or too fast in threatening the status quo. Working through the political channels has meant compromising with some of the institutional injustice. The more militant, dramatic voices of those who have refused to compromise their human rights were shot down. The Liberals in the Establishment accused them of being duped by Communists. Unwilling to incorporate the most alien elements of the distressed into the political system, the Liberals in the Establishment have become their chief enemy.

Both black and white Liberals have managed to silence voice after voice of protest. Their notion has been that progress comes through making deference to the white power structure on its foreign policy, its ethics, and its red-smear tactics. Those who have most clearly articulated the demands of the blacks have been put down. Malcolm X spoke for the poor blacks, giving them a new hope. But the Liberals wrote him off and further alienated him rather than listen to him. The assassin's bullet did not silence Malcolm X. Today many university students see him as a saint and a prophet. Similar views are held of Stokeley Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. They have tried to confront the Establishment to test its integrity. They have articulated the precarious condition of the American socio-political situation. The Liberals have considered them dangerous and insane. Perhaps this is why some blacks say they feel more secure around a southern-type conservative. They know what to expect from him. With the Liberal you can't be too sure what's going on when your back is turned.

Another man should yet be mentioned. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., at the time of his death, had fallen into disrepute with the Liberal Establishment. Why? Dr. King felt that the injustice of American involvement in Vietnam and the injustice at home were opposite sides of the same coin. The Liberals saw this linkage as compromising political genius and promoting political heresy. It has been typical for the Establishment Liberal to promote progressive domestic legislation and at the same support an imperialistic policy abroad. The Liberal wishes to preserve the present system, attempting to humanize it at home.

The Liberal is a person who expresses human concern for those he considers to be oppressed. He has lived the good life himself. His main concern is that those who are less fortunate than him be able to taste the good life too. The basic philosophical source of Liberalism is humanistic. It is not meant to be condescending, but that is what it turns out to be. The underlying assumption of Liberal doctrine is that all is well with me, but--due to unfortunate circumstances--all is not well with you. An observation of Liberal Establishment politicians points to this. There is an attempt to sell oneself as the strong man who can save his people in a time of crisis. The unrehearsed vocabulary is oriented around the first person singular--"I know this," or "I will change that."

A typical example of the lack of self-determination in Liberal Establishment philosophy may be observed. Recently, a black woman queried a great white Liberal about his solutions to the ghetto dilemma. His reply, "We'll make the necessary changes whether you understand them or not." It was this type of attitude which a playwright was alluding to when he told this writer, "Sentimentalism is sadism standing on its head." The masses are seen as asses who are unable to articulate their own needs. This assumption reeks of phoniness and condescension. It is in reaction to this kink of an attitude that university students are becoming increasingly interested in Marxist doctrine.

Advocates of social change are often under the impression that the John Birch types are the worst deterrents to change. Actually, the John Birchers may be preserving the right to dissent by the fact that they do it themselves. Furthermore, they are zealous and in many cases open for confrontation. Unlike many politicians and establishmentarians, they are open to the idea of debate. They are incapable of being subtle when their logic-tight compartments are exposed. They can do no more than harass social activists. They may file civil suits against those activating social change. But it is not they who determine justice. It is determined by those whose power is established. In a more subtle way justice is determined by whether the good-speaking Liberals sit back or not.

This writer, for one, would like to suggest a more subtle enemy than the John Bircher. It is perhaps the armchair Liberal who sits in his living room and talks about the good life. Perhaps the lethargy of armchair revolutionaries or utopian leftists is no more commendable, but at least they recognize the more subtle forms of injustice. The caustic

world view of the New Left is not without honor at the point that it recognizes social dishonor.

Hopefully, the provocations of this essay will create a clearer understanding of why young people were in the streets of Chicago during the Democratic Convention. This is not to say that they see any better alternatives offered in the current system of national politics. On November 5, 1968, some youth will refuse to vote, some will burn their absentee ballots, some will write in non-candidates who are symbols of ethical integrity rather than political realism, and those under twenty-one may stage sit-ins at the voting booths. It seems mandatory that those of us who are "privileged" become sensitized to how this dissent is related to human oppression. Can we continue to assume that "good-speaking" people have sole access to the floor merely because of their explicit allusions to God and their implicit illusions of being God?

* * * *

VERN McCARTY is a senior B.D. candidate from Laurel, Mississippi.

CELIA SMITHERS is a junior B.D. candidate from Moline, Illinois.

GRAHAM SHAW is a Th.M. candidate from Tadworth, Surrey, England.

PETER AMERMAN is a senior B.D. candidate from Sewickley, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM WILSON is a middler B.D. candidate from Hatboro, Pennsylvania.

GALEN YODER is a senior M.R.E. candidate from Hutchinson, Kansas.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 6, No. 3 November 15, 1968

THE CONTRIBUTORS

A MORAL ISSUE INDEED ..... Bill Johnson

AN AUTOPSY OF PRINCETON SEMINARY ..... Roderic P. Frohman

A BLACKER SHADE OF GRAY ..... John C. Robison

ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTION ..... Bill Larkin

ENDURANCE ..... Richard Tosh

THE EDITORS

John Patton Curtis Kearns Ted Atkinson Clark Wiser

Celia Smithers William Larkin Galen Yoder Jim Cubie

VIEWPOINT originated as a response to specific needs on the seminary campus. It is a semi-monthly publication evolving from a genuine concern for a medium to express campus opinion on pertinent issues, to expose creative writings otherwise unnoticed, and to stimulate intellectual and spiritual give and take within the theological community. We seek to maintain that spirit. Material should be submitted, preferably typewritten and double spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which it is to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

A MORAL ISSUE INDEED

Bill Johnson

I have just returned from a meeting of Black Churchmen in St. Louis, Missouri in which Black church leaders from all over the country were wrestling with complex problems of whether one can be authentically Black and at the same time Christian. Upon returning I found a statement which was published by the Church and Society Subcommittee on Education of the Student Government Association of Princeton Theological Seminary under my door. The statement, entitled: A Moral Issue--"Preamble to Dialogue", infuriated me like nothing else has done for some time.

In its statement the subcommittee has not only evidenced the naivete of the student body as a whole but has underscored the inability of the White man to break out of his historical bond of racism. That this is a strong statement to be made by a fellow student is true but I feel it necessary to use language that will leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to my position on these points. The fact is that Princeton Theological Seminary, with all of its liberalistic leanings is still, due to basic native concepts of Black-White relationships held by most Whites, racist in the final analysis. Reaching this conclusion has not been a shocking experience, for I expected this. Yet, I was hoping beyond hope, that somehow Princeton Seminary would prove to be different. That it has not has been evidenced not only in the aforementioned statement but also in most of the inter-student relationships which I've observed or participated in since being here. Therefore, the statement on "A Moral Issue" is but a concretized symbol of an inherent attitude.

To the immediate problem at hand. The "Preamble to Dialogue" asked one basic question and underlined three major concerns. The overall question was, "Can Princeton Theological Seminary ever fulfill its total educational tasks to Christian Ministry---?" Actually the statement should have stopped there. In failing to do so the subcommittee placed its neck upon the chopping block and I hope to perform the head cutting act with as much skill and finesse as possible.

The three stated concerns mentioned in conjunction with the basic question are these: (1) When the treasurer of this Seminary (Princeton) is Manufacturers Hanover Trust, an institution with extensive investment in South Africa, an officially racist and apartheid country, can this Seminary ever fulfill its total educational tasks to Christian ministry? (2) When the maintenance crew of this Seminary is conspicuous by its lack of Negro workers (same question)? And (3) When the Seminary, as an institution, has not spoken out on the crucial issues of war, racism and poverty can the Seminary, etc., etc., etc.,?

As I've already stated, the three concerns could be omitted for the basic premise which undergirds the question would still demand that I give a resounding NO for an answer. But before I get into that let me deal with the concerns. To me the three concerns are but one concern to all Black Americans and should be but one to all persons who are no longer entwined in the strangling grips of Americanism. To the subcommittee, how can you be so concerned about the business involvements of Manufacturers Hanover Trust in South Africa, a country far across the sea, when that banking firm and all others of its kind have been founded on and perpetuated by a principle of racism in a country that is no less racist than is South Africa--even official in some segments and subtle in all--our dear ole United States of America. It would seem to me that your major concern would be to call to the attention of Princeton Seminary and even to the nation the fact that business can no longer be business as usual as long as the business community continues to perpetuate and condone the economic and thereby the political death-hold on so large a segment of the American populus as the Blacks, Browns, and Reds of this nation. If Manufacturers Hanover can take its money out of

South Africa and other similar countries cannot it take its money out of Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia and even New Jersey? Or am I right when I conclude that racism under the guise of capitalism is so ingrained in our society and thus in our Seminary that we will continue to do naught but mouth platitudes and continue to sit on our posteriors of do-nothingness.

The second concern is the one that really got my water to boil, so to speak. I ask the subcommittee (here I'm struggling for nice words to say rather than use my secondary vocabulary) how in the name of whomever or whatever you worship (he, she or it must be White) can you be so completely out in right field when it comes to Black-White relationships? Do you think it bothers me one iota that there are not X number of Black maintenance men on the campus? Not one bit unless you are concerned about having X number of Whites as members of the cooking crew. Your basic problem is that your racial horizon is limited due to your inborn birth-rights. Your vision of genuine concern is blurred by the fog of your indigenous prejudice and your inability to grapple, in a meaningful way, with the problem of Black-Whiteness is curtailed by an inbred malignant disease called racism. You can only think of the Black man as a servant or as a domestic despite the fact that there are now nearly twenty Blacks enrolled at Princeton Seminary. Were you not what I have justifiably named you, your major concern would not have been for the "integration" (I hate that word) of the ground crew but rather for the presence of Blacks on the faculty and even more so for the presence of Blacks on the staff in administrative positions. Or are you after all, in spite of your liberalism, yet racist?

The third concern is not really a concern. It is endemic of all that I have spoken to. War is racism by force. Poverty is racism by deprivation. Racism is White-ism, period.

Finally, to the basic question. Can Princeton Theological Seminary ever fulfill its total educational tasks to Christian ministry? Yes it can. But not soon. Not until Princeton and all other artifacts of the Christian religion come to grips with the problem of divesting themselves of the weights of nationalism, of the influences of any economic system and of the miasma of a concept of man that allows the birth and growth of racial distinctions. Perhaps the Black militants are right when they say Christianity is synonymous with Whiteness. Perhaps the Black students at Princeton and the other White seminaries are fooling ourselves to think that we can be both Black and Christian. Princeton Seminary has a chore cut out for it; for if it ever hopes to fulfill its educational tasks to Christian ministry, it must make me believe that though I am Black I am also a child of the same God served by the Whites. It must also convince its students (even the members of this subcommittee to whom I have spoken) and the nation that the innate racial attitudes of White cut across the grain of all that Christianity stands for. I did not say "speak" to the students and to the nation, I said it must CONVINCE these persons that racism in any form is wrong. I have serious doubts as to whether this will ever happen. That is not before there is a death of the old conceptualizations of the idea of a Black-White dichotomy and the resurrection of a new world of one-ness from those ashes.

I hope this article has caused the subcommittee to become aware of its narrowness and will call itself into executive session to re-evaluate its position. Hopefully it will issue, the next time, a more meaningful statement which attempts to deal with the problems as they actually are. Then, perhaps, we can enter into serious and relevant discussion "during this period of re-examination."

AN AUTOPSY OF PRINCETON SEMINARY
(Uptight at Princeton Theological Seminary)

Roderic P. Frohman

The following is a preliminary report of the Church and Society Committee on Education at Princeton Seminary. The full report will be published in a month or so. This is not an "official" report of any kind, indeed that is why we publish it.

Serious young idealists within the church today are very frustrated. They find themselves within a structure that is calcified beyond belief. It is like Herbert Marcuse's description of advanced industrial society in One Dimensional Man. "A comfortable, smooth democratic unfreedom prevails in advanced industrial society" (read "church").

To understand the church in America one must understand this point in American history because the church has not escaped the one-dimensional sickness of American life. This sickness is the refusal of most Americans to change their life-style and outlook in the face of changes which are imperative. In this dilemma the church functions as a reminder to people that "things haven't really changed", that life can be comfortable and smooth. Amidst social revolution the church functions as an emotional and spiritual relief from the realities of everyday life.

The problem of the church is compounded because its seminaries are not creators of the future but affirmers of the status quo. The following is an address given by the author to an open meeting of students at PTS on October 30, 1968. It is an attempt to inject Princeton with a climate of conflict that will both produce change within the institution and at the same time make education at PTS vital. It is the opinion of the Committee on Education.

"In the spring of 1966 Time magazine reported the death of God in our society. This is not so tragic as it would seem. What is tragic is that God is dead here at Princeton where one would assume He would be found most alive. This conclusion is not a systematic theology of PTS or is it the proof text of certain persons' opinions. It is a sudden insight, an unveiling of what the nitty gritty of life here is all about. A "revelation" if you please. The following is an autopsy of the corpse.

"Two things are wrong; one, irrelevance and two, dead relevance.

"First of all we are arguing among ourselves about issues that were passé thirty years ago. Did it ever occur to us that most of the theology considered here is not a live option outside the sanctuary of these ivy-covered walls. We do not speak to the world. In a biblically illiterate age what do our clichés mean? Do we really speak to a world which is torn by racism and revolution. Who wants to be "reconciled", as one cliché goes, to a racist America. We also live in a world in which the "triumph of the therapeutic" has co-opted critical and creative dissent. In otherwords some of you now are saying to yourself "It's good for him to get this off of his chest," without even considering the argument herein.

"The relevant theology being done around here is trapped in a cold and sterile world of no conflict and repressed emotions. One of my friends from New York visited here recently. Her reaction was 'Does anyone around here ever scream?' Yes, I do know of a couple of cases...ever awakened to screams in the night? In this kind of environment how in the hell is it possible to do any meaningful theological thinking and creation? In this situation relevance is divorced from life. We speak words among people with whom we never speak. Our books are a fortress which protect us from others instead of leading into encounter. 'I've been Norman Mailered, Maxwell Taylored, John

O'Haraed, MacNamaraed.'

"The tragedy of this situation is two-fold: one, that the situation does exist, and two, that most students passively accept this situation.

"The reason this irrelevance exists is that the educational practice (not the philosophy) of this seminary has not changed since its inception. We attend a minister factory which cranks out parts for the ecclesiastical machine with the assumption that all the parts want to or will indeed fit. We attend a ministry factory that assumes a gas station practice of education, 'drive in and fill 'er up.' Then drive out and leave no exhaust.

"The second tragedy is the passivity of students. This seminary seems to be oblivious to the fact that education here perpetrates a dependent-passive student. What is more simple yet more enslaving than "lecture, read and regurgitate." In 1962 William Nisi wrote a Master's Degree thesis on seminary student dependency using PTS as his laboratory. It is available in our library.

"Part of the reason of this funeral parlor atmosphere is that the seminary refuses to recognize its responsibility to the world in the name of the seminary. PTS should take its example from Union Seminary. Its president, John C. Bennett has his name on numerous articles and pamphlets opposing the Vietnam War. A few weeks ago Arnold Come of San Francisco Theological Seminary at San Anselmo called off classes and urged his students to attend the trial of a seminarian who turned in his 4-D classification. He then called a news conference and defended the student. These are the kinds of things which make for vital education.

"We do not live in isolation here even though we would like to believe this and even though the geographical location of PTS leads one to conclude we do. We are not in isolation here because, in the name of the seminary, her finances are invested in apartheid South Africa via the courtesy of Manufacturer's Hanover Trust, the treasurer of PTS. These facts come to us from the American Committee on Africa in New York.

"Hence the indictment comes from two directions. The seminary commits evil by its action and also affirms the status quo by default. Like the unfaithful steward PTS has buried its talent to keep it safe. No the blood will not wash off. Vital education will come to Princeton Seminary when it as an institution recognizes that its lot is cast with all men.

"Hence the lack of a vital environment smothers all attempts to be relevant. However the Committee promises to make things vital given this condition. Vital theology is not comparing theology and the world in abstraction. Rather it integrates theology, students and the world. Dig it!

"I believe that men have two alternatives in life; one of holding back saving their lives, which is to commit suicide. The other is that of burning out their lives which is to be completely involved in History. Princeton Seminary is committing suicide and taking with it many unknowing students. As for me, I will burn baby, burn! Dig it!"

A BLACKER SHADE OF GRAY

John C. Robison

I have become disturbed upon seeing the manifestations of a prevailing attitude on the Seminary campus. The first demonstration occurred last year when the Comprehensive Examinations were dropped as a requirement. The second occurred this year when it was suggested that steps were being taken to eliminate the Greek and Hebrew requirement. I do not want to imply that I stood in favor of the comprehensives as fulfilling the purpurpose for which they were instituted. However, I do resent the lack of any supplementary program.

I see such a trend developing into very drastic implications for the Christian ministry. Along with most seminarians, I enjoy the fruits of an open-ended curriculum. Nevertheless, being a strong believer in the total depravity of man, I fear the number of narrow minded bigots that such a curriculum must produce by its very nature. Assumedly, or am I laboring under a false assumption, Seminary is meant to train men for the CHRISTIAN ministry, not for social work. I willingly and emphatically admit the social implications of the Christian faith; however Christ does not call us to be social workers (Mayor Lindsay is doing that much); rather he calls us to be Christian witnesses which involves something more than just social work. If the distinction is not drawn here, then Seminaries might as well close their Bibles and start preaching from the latest text on sociology.

The only alternative which I can see for the Seminary is one which many professors and students have suggested—that is to set up two curricula: one designed for those men who have definitely decided on the Christian ministry and the other designed for those whose interests lean toward the academic and sociological fields. I am not attempting to divorce the fields, merely their presuppositions and their end results.

ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTION

Bill Larkin

Text: "Who is my neighbor? Which now of these three thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among thieves?" And he said, "He that showed mercy on him." Then said Jesus unto him, "Go, and do thou likewise." (Luke 10:29,36)

Who is my neighbor? Whom am I responsible for? The mass media tells me it's the Negro, the poor, the disadvantaged. This cause and that tell me it's the handicapped, discriminated against, the culturally deprived. Who is my neighbor? Many times the confusion of so many answers given at once keeps us from hearing any answer at all. With technology's help we have increased the problem for now we are immediately and simultaneously faced with the war across the ocean and the unrest at home. Who is my neighbor? In the demand upon us to do everything we find ourselves accomplishing nothing. The lawyer in the discussion which occasioned the telling of the story of the Good Samaritan made this inquiry out of a desire to easily define his duty. We ask it out of desperation for our one world has made everyone our neighbor all at once.

Who is my neighbor?

A lawyer, a temple scribe, came to test Jesus' credentials for teaching. He asked him the basic spiritual question of the day. "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" As Jesus often did, he answered this question with a question, "What is recorded in the

law, how do you interpret it?" "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind and your neighbor as yourself." "That's right," said Jesus, "Do this and you will live." The lawyer wanted to get some standard so he could judge whether he had fulfilled these requirements. He knew in his heart whether his love for God was as complete as the commandment demanded. But the neighbor...he hadn't loved all men alike. There were those Gentiles, the heathen who did not have the light from God the Jews had. Did he have to love them in the same way he looked out for himself? What about those half-breed Samaritans? They had contaminated the pure Jewish blood line by intermarrying the Canaanites. They were too stubborn to come back to Jerusalem and worship. Besides, the other day one of their traders gyped my brother on some pottery, imperfectly made...Love your neighbor as yourself. But in a desire to justify himself the lawyer said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus answered this question with a parable. The story of the Good Samaritan. In the telling he showed that that question cannot be answered.

A man was traveling down from Jerusalem to Jericho. The road is a steep descent of 3000 ft. over fifteen miles. The way leads through a deep gorge. The sides of the cliffs are honeycombed with caves. Bands of thieves would use them as a base of operation to prey on unsuspecting travellers. This is what happened to the traveller in Jesus's story. The robbers pounced on him, beat him, robbed him, left him for dead.

"By chance, a certain priest and levite came that way."

"By chance"...Periodically in a large city like Chicago one witnesses the lack of concern of human beings for each other. In the midst of a busy hour an elderly woman slumps to the pavement of a downtown sidewalk. The flow of pedestrian traffic adjusts itself to skirt this new obstacle. Some kind person may stoop and drag her to prop her against the wall of a department store. All this time the woman is moaning, "Someone please help me, someone please help me." Sometimes at this sight, and more likely if it's a man, the jeers go up. "Must be drunk...guffaw". And, by chance, I've been there and known the tug of wanting to help and the icy paralysis of don't-get-involved...Who is my neighbor?

"By chance"...The Christian knows that what to the world is a coincidence is for him a God ordained opportunity. My neighbor then is not restricted to a set time or place of organized Christian service. I encounter him, by chance, as he falls across my path. For if we seek his good as we seek our own, love him as we love ourselves there is no time and no place where we cannot say I am not available I can't get involved.

A TV documentary a few months ago delved into the occurrence of racial prejudice in our fighting forces in Vietnam. To the surprise of the correspondents, the soldiers, when asked about what it felt like fighting alongside black men, said after bewildering hesitation, "I hadn't really thought about it. When you're out there fighting you need each other so you help anyone whose hurt because you know you would want him to do the same for you." The common danger had removed all barriers. By necessity, these soldiers wouldn't ask, "Who is my neighbor?" Their lives depend on each other, they can't be selective.

As Christians, it's not from necessity but from love that we not only don't choose the time and place but we don't select the kind of person who is our neighbor. The basis for loving our neighbor as ourselves is our whole hearted love for God. When we by faith love him, he fills us with a love for our neighbor. "If we love one another, it is God that dwells in us and his love is made perfect in us." What kind of love? Love as unconditional as our surrender with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength to Him. In the end, it is a love which won't allow us to ask the question, "Who is my neighbor?"

The question, rather, which we must continually ask is the one which Christ asked at the conclusion of the parable. "Which was neighbor to the one who fell among thieves?"--existentialized it is "Who can I be neighbor to?" As Christians we are all always a neighbor discovering the opportunities to show compassionate love to others. "Who is my neighbor?"...Who can I be neighbor to?"

ENDURANCE

Richard Tosh

The American dream of hard work producing success is alive in certain individuals in the younger society but this success motive is not the motivating force of today's youth. They are living now and they want to experience a sense of fulfillment in what they are doing now. If today is just a preparation for tomorrow it is not worth living through. The young adult would rather go to the Peace Corps than finish college; the young graduate would rather go to graduate school in psychology and theology than business administration; the draftee would rather go to jail than Vietnam. The search for truth and justice is more real than the search for the "American Way".

People who are involved in the search for the "American Way" often forget that truth and justice do not automatically follow them or their country. Those who come to the Church and to the religious practices of worship and prayer expecting to be comforted by expressed support of their preconceived notions are forcing themselves and the Church to turn from the light of truth in Jesus Christ.

Justice Fortas of the Supreme Court of the United States says that the limit of the methods of civil disobedience is that which our society can endure. I hope that all society can endure all that it is forced to and that it will be forced to endure all that it can. The Black Americans are going to test the endurance of the society and the youth are going to test the endurance of the Church. Just as a counselor of a potential suicide victim must accept suicide as a possible solution, so we, as the Church and as White America, must recognize that the destruction of our present identity is a viable option. The assumption that a youth is expressing no more than the dissatisfaction of youth may prevent the world from seeing that his society is not a carbon copy of the present society, that his church in no way resembles the Church, and that his god is a NEW GOD.

We can endure only when we do not have to hold helplessly onto the past and 'who we used to be'. If the Gospel of Jesus Christ is real to us, endurance is also real. "If a man is in Christ he becomes a new person altogether--the past is finished and gone, everything has become fresh and new." (II Corinthians 5:17).

* * * *

BILL JOHNSON is a Th.D. candidate from Knoxville, Tennessee.

RODERIC P. FROHMAN is a middler BD candidate from Berkeley, California.

JOHN C. ROBISON is a middler BD candidate from New Castle, Pennsylvania.

BILL LARKIN is a middler BD candidate from Chicago, Illinois.

RICHARD TOSH is a senior BD candidate from LaVale, Maryland.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 6, No. 4 December 6, 1968

THE CONTRIBUTORS

REPLY TO "A BLACKER SHADE OF GRAY" ..... Richard DeGraw

LETTER ..... Daniel Dingfield

PROPHET'S PARTING ..... Jim Lacy

HITTING THE NAIL ON THE HEAD ..... James Roghair

SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON "THE AUTOPSY OF PRINCETON SEMINARY" ..... Jonathan Jaberg

GOURMAND ..... Clark Wiser

SOME BIBLICALLY UNSUPPORTED REFLECTIONS ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT THE CHURCH SHOULD DO AND WHAT SHE HAS TO OFFER ..... Ted Atkinson

THE EDITORS

John Patton Curtis Kearns Clark Wiser

Celia Smithers William Larkin Galen Yoder

VIEWPOINT originated as a response to specific needs on the seminary campus. It is a semi-monthly publication evolving from a genuine concern for a medium to express campus opinion on pertinent issues, to expose creative writings otherwise unnoticed, and to stimulate intellectual and spiritual give and take within the theological community. We seek to maintain that spirit. Material should be submitted, preferably typewritten and double spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which it is to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

REPLY TO "A BLACKER SHADE OF GRAY"

Richard DeGraw

Doesn't it seem odd that in the last issue of Viewpoint, Mr. Robison entitles his article "A Blacker Shade of Gray", when actually what he creates is "Another Type of Darkness".

Mr. Robison says "Christ does not call us to be social workers" but rather "to be Christian witnesses." I should like to refer Mr. Robison to a very good volume on this subject; it's entitled the New Testament. In this radical book you find a hero who visits the prostitutes in some of the worst areas of the city; you find a young man who sins on the Sabbath by foolishly healing someone; you find a man who was a social worker and psychologist; a man to whom the "Christian ministry" (something invented later) meant reaching out to his fellow men and helping them out of the "total depravity" in which Mr. Robison believes.

Mr. Robison, look around! On the first two pages of Viewpoint a black man yells at us that academics do not feed, sooth, or love. Poverty can be translated from Greek or Hebrew, and it can be defined on the comprehensives, but unless the "Christian ministry" t does something besides study it, it is of no consequence.

Immediately following your article a man asks, "Who is my neighbor?" How many times has the scholarly Christian studied his neighbor's plight and then turned his back? Christ tells his disciples to work among the people, thereby spreading the love of God and the hope of the world. He doesn't say "Be a good Christian and I will change the world." He rather says, "YOU change the world!" We can't change the world unless we involve ourselves in it, which has too often not been the case with the "Christian ministry".

LETTER

Dear Editors:

I have been getting Viewpoint through the mail and that is very kind of someone. The words of your contributors fill me in a little on what is happening there. I hope you might share this communique with my friends there and give it a corner in Viewpoint if it merits it.

Being away this year is quite enlightening for it gives me another type of look at the Church and the Seminary. It is so amazing to be there, then leave, and look back on it. The November 15th issue of Viewpoint pointed out one thing to me, that the problems are still the same (I am referring primarily of the relationship of Bill Johnson's, Rod Frohman's, and John Robison's articles to each other). Let me pick up on one or two strands of thought in these articles if I may.

Mr. Johnson seems to find racism a rather genetic thing; it is "inbred, inborn, a birth right, and indigenous" in, it seems all white people. That's his thing and letters are no way to go over that. However, if one couples that with his statement that "Poverty is racism by deprivation," then the poor whites seem not only to be responsible for racism but also for poverty and that doesn't quite materialize as logical.

That isn't even the issue though; what troubles me is that the two opinions of Mr. Frohman and Mr. Johnson seem to miss communicating with one another entirely, and if that sort of disconnection continues at the Seminary as well as in the Church then Mr. Robison's type of thinking will prevail as it now does because his institutionalized

powers aren't being taken away from him. Mr. Johnson wants Mr. Frohman to prove that they participate in the same God. Mr. Frohman wants one man, three dimensions, indivisible under God, and committed, much to Philip Rieff's dismay. It all seems to be right there in Viewpoint and not connected with anything else but the publishing world. Everyone will not be united, Mr. Robison proves that. Get those that can be together and do something.

I learned one incredibly important lesson up here in Boston: 7th and 8th grade kids, black and white together, needn't publish bitches to get something accomplished, they just take over a school and, my, but you should see the political structure dance. These are kids, not parents! "Dig it??!!"

Since I left no one seems to have found the foci for attack there. Rhetoric still flies though, that's cool. Let me ask a couple of questions if I may. Why do the students allow the "proper channels" to okay the language requirement change? It would seem that there are ways that this year's Seniors could be made to be exempt from it. Why does one whole area devote itself to an oddity: Christian Education? Aren't there people there that think education is Christian? Mr. Robison you do need sociology texts and teachers, you need developmental reading courses so you can educate people that live in cities. Who is demanding anything relevant there and getting it now? Exegesis should be translating and writing New Texts for people to use IN new areas where the Old Church has failed to take the same God. These aforementioned verbal forays appear similar to the Church and its ways of functioning like man does when winter comes:

the sun is on vacation
songbirds are gone too
take inventory of our garbage
before the rain sluices it
into new cracks
and we don't recognize it.

See you soon,

Dan Dingfield

HITTING THE NAIL ON THE HEAD

James Roghair

I want to thank Mr. Johnson for his contribution to the last issue of Viewpoint. He hit the nail precisely on the head!

For those who want to hear it spelled out more thoroughly, and for those who are skeptical, run down to the Theological Book Agency and buy Beyond the Burning: Life and Death of the Ghetto by Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington, D.C., Urban League. We don't have to go to South Africa if we want to find banks and businesses who participate in White racism!

To add to what Mr. Johnson has said about the racism of the seminary, let me record two conversations. At the beginning of the semester, I queried a leading administrator of the seminary as to what steps Princeton was taking toward the development of Black curriculum. His reply came, "Dr. _____ is going to teach a course in Negro history, and Dr. _____'s courses are always good." Period, end of topic.

A certainly thrilling development! But as you know Dr. _____ has a definite pigmentation impediment when it comes to real Black curriculum. He will definitely deal with the intellectual issues, and do it well, but to whom or to what curriculum can the Black students turn for the real issues confronting them as they forge their own identities and theologies in 1968? Where are the issues of the peculiar "joys and sorrows of being Black" (quote by Elo Henderson, Catabaw Synod Executive) to be dealt with at Princeton?

A senior professor mentioned to me when I asked concerning the Seminary's policy toward acquiring Black professors that Princeton has no policy. It simply has very high standards which so far have precluded any policy. There aren't any Black theologians which meet Princeton's standards! Or are there?

Let's get with the times! Yesterday was the time, but maybe today isn't too late. Degrees and books and fame of a man are hog-wash compared with the real issues at stake: Can the man teach? Will he be an asset to the Seminary? Can the Seminary be an asset to the Black community in its struggle for real manhood.

Now is the time to be bold and daring, but it seems to be a conservatives' day. As Tucker says: "Ever since the March on Washington in 1963 the Church has grown more conservative. As the action of the militants has been stepped up, the Church has moved back inside." (op. cit., p. 148).

I am challenging us to get outside! It might be raining fire, but there is where the action is. And who knows, lily-white theology may be flammable.

PROPHET'S PARTING

Jim Lacy

Fare you well, people of Orphalese,
I sing to you a song of silence.
Wearily have I passed among you
Discovering only the prophecy of unfallen tears--
Must I now lament pointlessly with you
Over dust and no beginning
And no end?

We have tilled together in a garden of fragments
Reaping aloneness, winnowing chaff from chaff;
We have talked together of imaginings
In tongues twisted and obscure.
Our service to God has been
To lay plastic flowers at his grave.
Our singing is that of twelve-tone tinkling gongs--
Discordant twilight songs
Of dust and no beginning
And no end.

The ship which comes for me will have no sail.
Having made sense of the dream stuff of life
I shall sail on empty abstract seas.
Expect no regeneration--no rest upon the wind--
And of our songs no tower in the sky--
It will not matter that I was here at all
Nor that I sang to you a song of silence
Choked with dust and no beginning
And no end.

SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON "THE AUTOPSY OF PRINCETON SEMINARY"

Jonathan Jaberg

These critical comments on Rod Frohman's "Autopsy of Princeton Seminary" are offered because I believe that his concerns are important but that his analysis is lacking in some points. These observations, therefore, are put forward in the hope of encouraging further discussion about what this seminary is doing or should be doing; this, not to the end of repressing action but of making action more deliberative and hence, hopefully, more responsible.

Rod seems to divide his criticism into two main thrusts—one against the educational atmosphere of the seminary and another against the curriculum content. In scope, this is about as inclusive a critique of an educational institution as one could imagine. With regard to the educational practice, he does not like the cloistered academic atmosphere nor the lecture-read-reproduce format. The question is in part a matter of practice but there is also here an essential question as to just what theology is. To what extent is theology to be an existential activity? That is, what is the relative value of theology as our own creation within the swirl of our experience, divorced from theology as an academic discipline and study of the experiences of others? In the first place, it seems to me that these alternatives need not be mutually exclusive. However, in regarding the role of the seminary the question which poses itself to me is, What is the unique nature and content of Christian theology? It appears to me to be impossible to answer this question apart from a lecture-format and an atmosphere that makes possible academic discipline.

The "Autopsy" further asserts that the system at Princeton creates dependent-passive students. He cites a master's thesis study ("A Study of Dependency as a Dominant Personality Factor in Ministerial Students and its Implications for Theological Education," William Frederick Nisi, June, 1962) from which I quote: (preface, page ii) "When the computation of the data was finished the project was the opposite of what I had expected. The ministerial students were not significantly different from the college population in terms of dependency, and the inter-group findings indicated that there was a correlation between dependency and uncertainty." (page 41) "Thus the Princeton Seminary students as a group, do not according to our methodology, manifest high dependency needs the hypothesis is not confirmed." (page 42) "Thus there seems at this stage of preparation to be a correlation between the certainty of vocational plans and dependency needs. Those who are uncertain tend to show higher dependency needs than those who feel certain concerning their future plans." The point of all this is that if seminary students are passive we cannot place the blame of dependency characteristics uniquely created by Princeton's system; we must look for the source elsewhere.

As a partial solution, Rod suggests that the seminary take a stand on major social issues in the name of the seminary. It occurs to me that seminary and the Presbyterian Church with which it is affiliated is composed of many individuals with varying opinions on social and political issues. For Dr. McCord to speak for this heterogeneous group would be as difficult as President-elect Nixon speaking for the people of the United States, with the added burden that Dr. McCord would be speaking for God. It would be provocative if Dr. McCord were to personally take a public stand on social issues but with regard to the seminary program as a whole, it seems to me that the question again is, What is the unique nature of Christian theology and to what questions does it speak? Judgment of contemporary society on the basis of Christian ethics is certainly a valid and needful enterprise, but if it is made primary Christain theology loses its identity—classical Confuscian ethics would serve just as well.

As a second main division the "Autopsy" disapproves of the content of theology as it is presented at Princeton. In the first paragraph of his address, Rod makes this

statement: "What is tragic is that God is dead here at Princeton where one would assume He would be found most alive." This is a profound and admirable expression. Unfortunately, however, the thrust of this statement is allowed to die in the context of the address as well. Indeed, this is the last time in the text that God's name is mentioned. In concluding, Rod asserts that "Vital education will come to Princeton seminary when it as an institution recognizes that its lot is cast with all men" and that the preferred life alternative of men is "that of burning out their lives which is to be completely involved in History." This is all quite true, but it is also quite compatible with a naturalistic humanism. If Christian theology is to be significant it must have something unique to offer to the situation; Christian theology must be distinguishable from humanism or it is nothing but chaff.

In his concluding remarks Rod says that "Vital theology is not comparing theology and the world in abstraction. Rather it integrates theology, students and the world." The proper function of "vital" theology qua Theology seems to be integrating theology, students and the world. It seems to me that Rod employs two senses of the term "theology" here, i.e. theology as the very act of integrating and theology as one of the factors which is itself integrated. This point is not objected to, but pointed out merely to assert that while we are integrating theology and all the rest we must have something to integrate. The question of the content of one's theology is an essential one, determining even the kind of integration one reaches, and must be a primary concern of theological education.

Finally, perhaps the key concept here is Rod's plea for "relevant" theology. As a start, Rod seems to want to abandon all the passé theology and the "clichés" which no longer are considered meaningful by the world. If we are to make this move we must first consider its significance. By eliminating some of the "clichés" we are not simply changing language, we are changing the essential nature of our message. Setting aside for the moment personal precommitments on the issues, let us recognize that words such as "sin" and "salvation" and "reconciliation" refer to unique theological concepts and categories; if these words are irrelevant today it is because the world no longer understands or uses the word-referrent. It is a perversion, for example, to try to make "sin" relevant to the contemporary scene by calling it "error" because these words simply do not refer to the same category. The secular world today simply does not have terms corresponding to many of the categories in which the faith has historically been couched. So then we must seriously consider the possibility that in changing the expression of our faith in order to communicate we may be essentially changing the faith. What then is the unique value of that which we communicate—again, why do we call it "Christian"?

In analyzing the problems of Princeton Seminary it seems to me that Rod has omitted a central point which I see as also contributing to the failures of theological education here, i.e. a failure to distinguish and affirm the essential nature of the Christian faith. We must have this foundation of the uniqueness of our faith before we can build and develop implications of that faith for our world. Part of my problem with Rod's address undoubtedly stems from the fact that it is impossible to expound fully the implications of Christianity within the restricted scope of two typewritten pages. To the extent that this restriction is the difficulty then, the above observations are offered as complementary considerations which ought not to be overlooked in our common quest for relevant theological endeavor. And yet, if full expansion of Christianity is not possible in capsulated form, still it seems to me that there are basic affirmations that uniquely characterize the faith which must be an explicit basis for any activity or position that is called "Christian", viz. that Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, was God Himself providing a path of restoration to Himself for sinful men through His ministry, substutitionary death and bodily resurrection. I must see the, if not exhaustive in all cases primary and essential, role of the church (hence, of its ministers and seminaries) as a proclamation of these affirmations and a challenging of men to surrender their lives to the Lordship of Jesus Christ. I would submit that

this position is not simply another possibility of subjective interpretation but is the most consistent with the Scriptures and the historical formulation of the Christian faith. I must be opposed therefore to any effort to interpret Christianity which results in an essential change or deletion of the historic faith. In our effort to be relevant we must not lose the uniqueness of our faith or it won't make much difference whether we're relevant or not - we won't really have much to contribute.

GOURMAND

Clark Wiser

Let us gorge ourselves on a feast
 of words ...
Let them fall about our feet like
 gnawed bones ...
The courses follow one upon the other,
 in lavish profusion ...
Have a large helping of philosophy,
 a soupcon of theology ...
The wine of our discourse is
 heady, indeed ...
My cup runneth over, and I am
 drunk on words and ideas ...
Speak to me of Plato or Christ,
 reason with me ...
Offer me platitudes and
 homilies ...
Let us edit this notion and delete
 that feelings
Leaving nothing to chance ...

Isn't it lovely the way everything
 fits comfortably into
Place? We prove our judgment
 far wiser than our instincts ...
And we discuss it cleverly and
 are very sophisticated ...
Why not close our eyes, stop our
 mouths and silence our
Heartbeats? If we try, we can
 pretend that we never lived at
 all ...

It is so much easier this way,
 with all our thinking and
Living done for us. Let the banquet
 come to an end. Let the
Hours and days and years sift
 down the black shaft of
 time ...
Somewhere it all ends in a dazzling
 blaze of purest light ...
And then, what matter if we
 never knew for sure that Christ
 meant for us to live here and
 now?

SOME BIBLICALLY UNSUPPORTED REFLECTIONS ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT THE CHURCH SHOULD DO AND WHAT SHE HAS TO OFFER

Theodore Atkinson

My purpose is to show the difference between what the Church should do and what she has to offer. My presupposition is that what the Church should do is not what she has to offer; that the scandal of Christianity is the irrelevance of what she has to offer.

What the Church should do can be answered from the perspective of either the Christian or the non-Christian because what the Church should do is not specifically or uniquely Christian. What the Church should do is love God, love her neighbor, and love herself. This is not specifically or uniquely Christian.

Loving God and loving yourself are basically inward things which find their concrete expression only in loving neighbor whether he be friend or enemy. It is true that only the individual can stand before God in rebellion or love; only the individual can stand before his "self" in love or despair. However, the individual would not be able, as an individual, to love either God or his "self", if it were not for the fact that he lives in community. The individual derives the concepts of both God and "self" from his community. The natural result (and I emphasize "natural") of love for God and for one's "self" is a loving attitude for one's neighbors producing actions.

So we can speak of what the Church should do only in terms of loving her neighbors since this is the only way love for God and self can be expressed overtly. This love is expressed both individually and corporately; abstractly and concretely.

The corporate expression of love has been a controversial subject in the Church for most of the twentieth century. "Should the Church become involved in politics or social problems? Should not the Church's mission be confined to the preaching and teaching of the Gospel?" These questions have risen because many people do not realize the difference between what the Church should do and what She has to offer.

When the question, "Should the Church become involved in politics?" is asked it is not realized that the Church already is an indispensable part of the political structure; that she supports or tears down the political structure even when she remains silent; that she is by her very nature firmly entrenched in politics. That being so, the Church <u>should</u> realize it and work constructively, corporately and individually to apply Christian principles to the political structure; to continually reform and convert <u>both</u> politicians and the political structures.

When the question, "Should the Church become involved in social problems?" is asked, it is not realized that the Church corporately and individually already is a part of the social structure and part of the social system. Corporately it can intensify the conditions of poverty, unemployment, and disease by silence. At times, regrettably, as Walter Rauschenbusch has pointed out, "The Church has turned the indicative statement of Jesus, 'The poor you will always have with you.' into the imperative, 'Seek to keep the poor always among you." Corporately the Church should speak out loud and clear and act decisively to attack not only the manifestations but the root causes of poverty and other social evils.

What the Church should do is stated by the rather evangelical atheist, Albert Camus, when he said,

> "What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out loud and clear in such a way that never a doubt, never the slightest doubt, could rise in the heart of the simplest man. They should get away from abstraction and confront the bloodstained

> face history has taken on today. The grouping we need is a grouping of men resolved to speak out clearly and pay up personally. We are still waiting, and I am waiting, for a grouping of all those who re-refuse to be dogs and are resolved to pay the price that must be paid so that men can be something more than a dog."

What the Church should do and what She has to offer are two qualitatively different things.

The Church has absolutely nothing relevant to offer.

That is, the Church has nothing to offer that is relevant to the world. Dietrich Bonhoeffer has seen this distinction between what the Church should do and what it has to offer when he wrote,

> "We must ask, is it correct to say that it is the task of the church of offer solutions to the world for its problems? ... Jesus concerns himself hardly at all with the solution of worldly problems. When he is asked to do so his answer is remarkably evasive. Indeed he scarcely ever replies to men's questions directly, but answers rather from a different plane. His word is not an answer to human questions and problems; it is the answer of God to the question of God to man ... It is not a solution, but a redemption."

Whenever the Church confuses what she should do with what she has to offer the scandal of Christianity and the dialectic of the Incarnation is lost. The Church has only one thing to offer and that is the righteousness of Christ which means reconciliation with God. To the vast majority of the middle-class, the upperclass, or the avante-garde radicals on the left and right, what Christianity has to offer is neither exciting or relevant; in fact it's kind of embarassing.

The Church has only one thing to offer; that is God, but it demands everything. And what Christianity demands of you can be answered only by yourself. If you are living in middle-class or aristocratic comfort, seeking comfort, don't come to Christianity because it very well might have only discomfort for you even if it is only the discomfort of trying to justify your comfort. If you are among the radical right or left with THE ANSWER Christianity offers only a question to all of your answers. Neither does Christianity offer mental stability or intellectual arguments for deliverance from anxiety, doubt, or hunger. Christianity offers only God.

Christianity offers only God because that is all there really is to offer. And I'm not even sure what it means to be offered God; to receive Jesus Christ. Because even after I have accepted the offer I'm not sure that I have Him or that it makes any difference, now or later, except for the demands and the anxiety of having all of my answers questioned by God.

C.S. Lewis has said it well,

> "You know my history ... I believed in God before I believed in heaven. And even now, even if—let's make an impossible supposition—His voice, unmistakedly His, said to me, 'They have misled you. I can do nothing of that sort for you. My long struggle with the blind forces is nearly over. I die, children. The story is ending.' Would that be a moment for changing sides? Would not you and I take the Viking way: 'The Giants and the Trolls win. Let us die on the right side, with Father Odin.'"

The Church offers reconciliation to God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ. That's all. What Christ said is not especially profound. What he did for the outcast and poor is not unique. Others have helped the poor and healed the sick before and after Jesus of Nazareth. What he said did not reveal any depth of genius or beauty. What Christ offers us is not enhanced by extraordinary intellect, beauty, psychological insight, or physical health.

Søren Kierkegaard realized very well what Christ has to offer when he wrote the following words,

> "A priest who is quite correct in his discourse would, when quoting the words of Christ, have to speak in this way: 'These words were spoken by Him to whom, according to His own statement, is given all power in heaven and on earth. You who hear me must consider within yourselves whether you will bow before his authority or not, accept and believe the words or not. But if you do not wish to do so, then for heaven's sake do not go and accept the words because they are clever or profound or wonderfully beautiful, for that is a mockery of God.' For, once the command of authority, of the specific paradox-authority, is posited, then all relationships are qualitatively changed, then the kind of acceptance which was previously allowable and desirable becomes a crime, a presumptious."

There is a qualitiative paradoxical difference between what the Church should do and what she has to offer. She should love, and express her love for her neighbor in concrete actions but she offers nothing but reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ. To destroy this paradox is to destroy Christianity and make the Incarnation meaningless.

* * * * * * *

RICHARD DE GRAW is a junior BD candidate from King of Prussia, Pennsylvania.

DANIEL DINGFIELD is on his intern year in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

JAMES LACY is a junior BD candidate from Kensington, Maryland.

JAMES ROGHAIR is a senior BD candidate from McMinnville, Oregon.

JONATHAN JABERG is a junior BD candidate from Riverside, Illinois.

CLARK WISER is a junior BD candidate from Los Angeles, California.

THEODORE ATKINSON is a senior BD candidate from Newark, Delaware.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 6, No. 5 December 13, 1968

THE CONTRIBUTORS

REACTION TO A MISCONCEPTION ..... C. André Kearns

PAPER-DOLL PEOPLE ..... Connie Leean

WOW: A LETTER ..... Floyd Brady

THIS BABE IS GOD'S MESSIAH ..... Clark Wiser

THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPEL AND RACE ..... Cullen I. K. Story

THE EDITORS

John Patton Curtis Kearns Clark Wiser Jim Cubie

Celia Smithers William Larkin Galen Yoder

VIEWPOINT originated as a response to specific needs on the seminary campus. It is a semi-monthly publication evolving from a genuine concern for a medium to express campus opinion on pertinent issues, to expose creative writings otherwise unnoticed, and to stimulate intellectual and spiritual give and take within the theological community. We seek to maintain that spirit. Material should be submitted, preferably typewritten and double spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which it is to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

REACTION TO A MISCONCEPTION

C. André Kearns

Realizing it is imperative for a minority group to have unity in the face of adversity, the black students of Princeton Theological Seminary have formed an organization. After serious consideration of the problems which plague this particular community the following Preamble to the Constitution was adopted:

> "In the light of existing concepts of integration in the context of assimilation, we the Black Students of Princeton Theological Seminary, with a consciousness of reality, seek to establish an atmosphere of equity. Experience compels us to acknowledge the following points of dissent:
>
> a. The lack of empathetic Black professionals in the seminary community.
> b. The noticeable void in cross-cultural curriculum development.
> c. The lack of elective field work and vocational placements, rather than selective.
> d. Long-standing prejudices in the social context.
> e. General bigotry.
>
> We therefore seek to expose, in order to rectify, these inequities by the following:
>
> a. Establishing Black unity and identity.
> b. Emphasizing cross-cultural communication.
> c. Initiating community inter-action.
> d. Furthering realistic social encounter.
>
> With these aims in mind we commit ourselves to these principles of Black consciousness through the formation of the Association of Black Seminarians..."

I would like to draw special attention to two specific phrases in this statement, "Experience compels us to acknowledge the following points of dissent: (1) The lack of empathetic Black professionals in the seminary community; (2) The void in cross-cultural curriculum development."

I was recently approached with the issue of the noticeable lack of black professors on campus. The individual with whom I was discussing the issue advocated the hiring of a professor to help alleviate this condition, but he was peeved to the point of moderate indignation by my apparent unconcern. After much discussion he proclaimed "all everybody is waiting for is the black students to demand that a black professor be appointed."

I must admit I was somewhat amused at the inane and anachronistic implications of this statement, for besides obvious paternalistic overtones there is a definite manifestation of the white community's naivety toward the whole issue of cultural exchange.

In the first place the mere substitution of the term demand for the antiquated image of the Black humbly seeking favor is insufficient to dismiss the obvious paternalism inherent in this statement.

But this fact comprises only one small aspect of the true implications of this statement, for we are here given a blatant example of the ignorance bred by prejudice, i.e., prejudice narrows the perspectives of individuals thus rendering them incapable of truly objective and integrated thought.

It is obvious to the critical observer that the hiring of one black professor would merely comprise a token gesture. Although tokenism in relation to the black population has unfortunately become an established objective, I think it is fair to say in this instance that tokenism would simply be used as a form of 'liberal exhibitionism.'

This is not an arbitrarily chosen phrase, I assure you, for we all know that our current intellectual emphasis lies in the concept of dialogue. But even deceptive dialogue requires individuals who either label themselves as different or physically appear different.

In this sense, it is necessary for black people to be present during dialogue involving racial topics, even if their presence in reality impedes actual progress.

In a similar sense it is definitely advantageous to demonstrate a liberal image during these Post-Kennedy and Pre-Nixon times, for White America now readily accepts and even begs for the black man who represents no personal threat or who through assimilation has proven himself truly domesticated. The advertising enterprise has caught on, industry has caught on, why not the seminary.

This is liberal exhibitionism in its most conspicuous form, but this token approach is disastrous in an educational setting. This is the reason I have attempted to use the preceding discussion to establish one basic point: one black faculty member among approximately forty-eight whites, teaching from a totally white perspective in an area dominated by white opinion, could not and would not be an individual, for in reality such a person would be forced to assume the role of a manipulated, and powerless figurehead used only for reasons of exhibitionism.

This fact implies that the only real prospect for change in this area lies in the area of curriculum revision with the question of faculty personnel representing a secondary issue.

But herein lies a gross misconception on the part of the white population, for all matters concerning cross-cultural education are viewed either as appeasements or as matters of pacification.

Reflect on the nature of a recent statement from a Viewpoint article entitled "Hitting the Nail on the Head." The author states, "to whom or to what curriculum can the Black students turn for the real issues confronting them as they forge their own identities and theologies in 1968?" In its own context this statement demonstrates amazing insight and flexibility on the part of the author, but he unfortunately falls into the age old trap of writing from an extremely narrow perspective.

Is it truly that difficult for Princeton's white community to perceive the conspicuous need for a cross-cultural and educationally balanced academic atmosphere?

When one implies it is the duty of the black community to demand specific changes, one is in essence conceding the fact that such changes serve to benefit the black community only.

Education in twentieth century America is one dimensional and in this sense the dominant representatives of this culture, i.e., America's Whites, stand to gain significantly from any innovations introduced to its educational system.

This is why it is a travesty to conceive of curriculum revision in relation to race as an appeasement or liberal offering to the black community, for White America would derive equal if not greater advantages by gaining the necessary implements for peaceful coexistence in a society which will soon emphasize coexistence instead of assimilation.

PAPER-DOLL PEOPLE

Connie Leean

Have we now become
like so many
paper-doll people, flimsy
and weak in half-
baked business,
clumsy and bleak with
colorless cognitions.
Why stare at me
With your
nothingness
eyes;
though empty, I fear
they betray a controlled mind
not willing to
risk
analyze.

Are we now looking
like so many
paper-doll people, turning on
several colorful fronts and
trying
to hide
our dull,
empty
backs.
With cocktails dangling
the chatter turns
to styles that change.
Why smile at me
with your pallid mouth
curled
in complacent lines, I fear
it betrays an
uneasiness
with times that change.

Will we now be
like so many
paper-doll people, flattened
by machines with
the consumer's stamp
of approval,
safe
to use in quantities.
Why silent before me,
waiting
for the courage
to speak? I fear
the din of time
will soon overwhelm you.

Now is The Time To
open your ears
and see
the prophet
of the paper-doll decree:
"Punch out along the dotted line,
Discard for new color and design."

WOW

During my limited time here at Princeton Seminary I have read most of the issues of Viewpoint. It has been quite interesting to see and hear the intellectuals pouring out their pearls of wisdom. I think a more appropriate name for Viewpoint would be "Rebuttal." It seems to me that most of the articles written are take-offs on the previous issues. Perhaps this should be a graduate school in literary criticism rather than a seminary.

Every other week when I pick up the Viewpoint, I run upstairs, open the door, jump in my rocking chair (which I know is a luxury but...) pull off my shoes and begin to read my Viewpoint to see which or what person will have the nerve to write what they feel, to subject themselves to their fellow seminarians. Many of the articles I have read have dealt with social issues, which, as I understand in many circles aren't the things to talk about. Issues such as whether or not the minister is a social worker or better yet, whether or not Christ was. But, I guess one of the central issues on campus and a question perhaps all of us have asked ourselves is, what do I say to my friends, my countrymen, and my parishoners about these issues?

There have been autopsies given, enhancing of letters, adding to letters, taking away from letters, analyses of letters, critiques of letters, comments on letters, etc., etc., etc., and just plain old letters.

I haven't taken many theology courses nor do I know much about Hermeneutics, Homiletics or the Third Article. But, I do know that Christ...Well, maybe I won't say that for fear of misinterpreting the scriptures. It seems to me one would only have to be human to be concerned about injustice, suffering, poverty and exploitation. Maybe I could have used only the latter word. It seems to me one could be only a little old human being and speak out against dehumanization. One would not have to have a large church or a small church to be concerned about other people, concerned enough to act. But, perhaps I am assuming too much. From what I understand, capitalism does have the tendency to dehumanize people. I had forgotten for a moment that the emphasis is on individual achievement, everyone doing their own thing. (Please excuse my use of this worn out word). Well, if Horatio Alger made it, anybody can. I guess it is difficult to be concerned when we are told everyday that with hard work anybody can make it. I guess it is kind of difficult to be concerned especially when we go home and see the results of hard work. I guess it is hard to act when we hear everyday that this is the land of freedom, justice, and equality. It is difficult to act when we have what we want and what we need. I had better be careful in what I say. I would hate to be talking about concern for others, that sounds too much like socialism or communism. But, I guess I wouldn't want to give away my hard earned time and money to someone who could make it if they tried.

The Black man in America starts from here, realizing your time is valuable, your money is valuable, you are quite busy and this is a country of rough individualism. From here he begins to map out a strategy that will be most beneficial for the masses: the whole Black Power kick. For those who are wondering what to say to their congregations and friends, perhaps you could tell them that the Black man realizes that you

are quite busy, that you believe in rugged individualism, that he could make it if he tried and that you believe he is inferior. So, they are going about in their own collective way, the best way they know how to remedy their plight. Just tell them he is going to do just what you make him do to attain justice and make freedom and equality a reality. Oh yes, don't forget to tell them there is always a place for anybody who wants to be aware and concerned. I think we have seen enough specials on TV, gone to enough lectures and talks, had enough discussions, listened to enough sermons, had enough panels and read enough papers to know the troubles America faces. Now, we must act, not talk about it.

Floyd X
X Brady
X X

PS. I think this letter is quite clear and self-explanatory. If anyone does not understand it, please reread and listen to what is being said.

THIS BABE IS GOD'S MESSIAH

Clark Wiser

Near Bethlehem of Judah,
Where lived once Israel's king,
The warm clear air was laden
With fragrances of spring.
Through pastures still and peaceful
Beneath the studded sky,
Wafted songs of watchful shepherds,
Whose sheep around did lie.

The tranquil meadowed hillocks,
The bent Judean palms,
In wistful meditation,
All heard the shepherds psalms,
"He tends the flocks of Jacob,
Our Shepherd-God adored.
His rod and staff us comfort.
Be praised our faithful Lord!"

The sheep-bells' gentle tinkling,
The tunes of pipe and reed
Accompanied the wonder,
That night by God decreed.
In Bethlehem of Judah,
To man God's love to bring,
Was born within a manger
Our Lord and blessed King.

By mankind yet unnoticed,
Angelic hosts with awe
Saw Christ in stable lowly
Laid cradled in the straw.
Then quickly to the shepherds,
Man's anxious fear to quell,
The angels sped rejoicing,
The wond'rous news to tell.

To Bethlehem now hasten
   To see your promised King!
To you God's love revealing,
   He earth's salvation brings.
Seraphic hymns melodic
   The fields and meadows fill.
To God be joyful praises!
   To men on earth good will!

O love of God most wondrous!
   O mercy full and free!
My faithful Lord, Redeemer
   From sin hath rescued me.
I once an erring sheep was found
   In hopeless, brutal plight,
By fear and trepidation bound,
   On steep and craggy height.

Beyond all expectation,
   When hope and faith had fled,
And I in desperation
   Lay bleeding, filled with dread,
God did His Son beloved send
   To save me from death's claim,
My lonely, anxious cries to end,
   To cleanse away my shame.

Before, whene'er the story
   Of Bethlehem I heard,
Of manger, shepherds lowly,
   Of angel's song and word,
It all seemed fanciful and strange.
   'Til once at Calvary
God worked within my heart a change:
   "Twas all," He said, for thee.

"For thee the seraph-herald
   Announced Messiah's birth,
Melodious hallelujahs
   Proclaimed good will on earth,
And brightly shown the wondrous light
   To lead thee to thy Lord,
To guide thy steps through sin's bleak night,
   To thee new life afford."

O Bethlehem, with yearning
   I come with aching heart,
From distant lands returning,
   From thee to ne'er depart.
Within thy stable Christ is born,--
   My Savior, Lord is He!--
Around all gleams, ere breaks the morn,
   And shines His love on me.

THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPEL AND RACE

Cullen I. K. Story

Viewpoint has featured a number of articles recently dealing with the race issue, and then last night (Monday) came the stirring clarion call to social action by Dr. Ralph Abernathy to an over-flow audience in Miller Chapel. My own thinking in recent days has been directed to the same issue, and so, for what they may be worth, I want to offer a few thoughts on the gospel and race.

Years ago, a Jewish widow arrived at Bethlehem. Tragedy had stalked her path ever since she had left her home town more than ten years earlier. Her husband and two sons lay buried in the parched country of Moab. So much did her own demeanor bear the marks of this tragedy that the women of Bethlehem hardly recognized her. "Can this be Naomi?" they asked. To which she responded, "Don't call me Naomi, call me 'bitter'. That name will suit my condition for the Almighty has made my life bitter and restored me to Bethlehem empty." All of which meant that Naomi saw ahead of her only an empty meaningless existence. A little over a year later, the same Jewish woman -- still a widow -- held in her bosom a male offspring, child of her new son-in-law Boaz, and of her daughter-in-law Ruth who had returned from Moab with her. So changed was her demeanor now that the Bethlehem women, seeing the child cradled in her lap, exlaimed, "A child is born to Naomi!" They named the infant "Obed" meaning "a serving one," and they claimed that he would serve as a restorer of Naomi's life.

The obvious question is how Naomi travelled the path that led from tragedy and emptiness to a life of unexpected fullness. The answer may not be fully known. But one thing is clear. On her path, Naomi encountered the complete commitment and dogged loyal determination of another widow, Ruth the stranger from Moab. It is to Ruth that the writer of this story attributes the memorable words addressed to Naomi -- "where you go, I will go . . . your people will be my people, your God my God." Jewish and Moabitess - How impossible the combination! Mother-in-law and daughter-in-law - How tenuous the relationship! And yet, their commitment and loyalty to each other are etched in each part of the narrative. The amazing story stands on its own merits but surely it mirrors another story even more amazing, the story of the sociological miracle of the first century A.D. -- Jew and Gentile united in one body in Christ. This is the gospel. And precisely in this gospel I discover an answer to the searching questions which Bill Johnson and Rod Frohman have posed in Viewpoint (November 15th). The gospel does make it possible for one who is black to be a child of God, yes, even for the one who is white to be a child of the same God. Bill reminds us that the black-white dichotomy is still with us but let us not fail to remind one another that such a dichotomy receives its long-deserved death-blow through the cross and resurrection of Jesus. D-day is a fact, says Cullmann. The agony of the continued conflict and tension among races drives us in faith to the triumph of the Risen one who unites men of faith in his one body. This theology may be 2,000 years old but it was never more relevant than it is today.

As I see it, the gospel strikes at the heart of irrelevance, of passivity, and of non-involvement. Rod claims, however, that in these very areas the Seminary is sadly deficient. Perhaps so. To the extent that his charge is true we should welcome Rod as a gadfly of the gospel. I find it hard to believe, however, that there is little involvement of students in field work, little relevance to anything that is taught, and only a meek-like passivity of students in their encounter with fellow students and with faculty in class and discussion groups. Somehow I still believe that God is alive here and has a stake in Princeton Seminary. But be this as it may, let us hope that, amid the racial tension and agony of our times, the gospel itself will continue to hound us on the path of involvement and, as Dr. Abernathy put it, make our pillow hard and give us no peace. The gospel calls us to plod, to minister patiently to the the one in need, to submit our commitment to the scrutiny of the Holy one in both

private and corporate worship, to make the church sensitive to prejudice, injustice, and to think through the long-term answer that has deeper implications than the "quickie" solution of the moment.

I'm reminded that in Dickens' Old Curiosity Shop, young Nell poured out her few brief years in a well-nigh hopeless effort to rescue her old grandfather from the gamblers' disease. The real crisis comes when Nell discovers that the old man is also a thief. At an inn late at night she sees him gloat over the coins he has just pilfered from Nell's room -- the only coins that she possessed. Later, as the old diseased gentleman sleeps, Nell bends over his bed and says, "God bless him, he has only me to help him." Viewpoint underscores racism as the ugly disease of our times, of our society and of our church, and that with all cunning and subtlety the same disease often colors our own thinking and action. The charge is true. The disease is with us. What then? Nell says of her diseased grandfather, "He has only me to help." Ruth says of embittered Naomi, "She has only me to help." But the Risen one in his gospel speaks of our society and of our church using a different pronoun - "They have only you to help," and he addresses the words to us -- we who confess that we are sinful and yet who confess that he is our Lord.

Ruth committed herself to Naomi, and the path they travelled led to a new beginning in the birth at Bethlehem of the infant Obed, "a serving one." The path which you and I take -- if it be one of involvement and commitment -- may lead us to a new beginning in our understanding of the birth of another infant, one Jesus -- also born at Bethlehem -- who came not to be served but to serve and to give his life a ransom for many.

* * * * * * *

C. ANDRE KEARNS is a senior BD candidate from Roanoke, Virginia.

CONNIE LEEAN is a senior MRE candidate from Iola, Wisconsin.

FLOYD BRADY is a junior BD candidate from Chicago, Illinois.

CLARK WISER is a junior BD candidate from Los Angeles, California.

CULLEN I. K. STORY is assistant professor of New Testament.